

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 17 as set forth above. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

Despite Applicants' traversal, the Office has maintained that the restriction requirement in this application is proper. Accordingly, claims 23-30 (Group II) are withdrawn from consideration.

With respect to the Office's indication that the page with the Applicants' names, addresses, citizenship, and signatures is missing from the file, Applicants hereby submit a copy of the combined Declaration and Power of Attorney as filed with this application. The names, addresses, citizenship, and signatures of the Applicants are clearly shown on page 2 of the Declaration.

The Office has rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 12, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,301,047 to Hoshino et al. (Hoshino). In addition, the Office has rejected claims 9-10, 14-16, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoshino and claims 4, 13, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoshino in view of U.S. Patent 6,583,415 to Stevens. In particular, with respect to independent claims 1, 11, and 17, the Office asserts that Hoshino discloses a system for identifying at least one object, the system comprising, a signal transceiver system 11, 12a, 12b that detects a polarized light signal from the at least one object 1 and a signal processing system that identifies at least one characteristic (see col.6, lines 7-8) of the at least one object in response to the detected polarized light signal (see col.4, lines 25-65). In addition, with respect to claim 2, the Office asserts that Hoshino teaches a system for identifying at least one object further comprising a reflective surface 1 (see Figure 1) on at least a portion of the object X.

However, neither Hoshino nor Stevens, either taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a system for identifying at least one object, a method for identifying at least one object, or a computer readable medium having stored thereon instructions for identifying at least one object "wherein the at least one object reflects the polarized light signal without diffracting the polarized light signal" as recited by claims 1, 11, and 17.

To the contrary, Hoshino specifically teaches the following on page 6, lines 10-28:

“[W]hen light is reflected by normal optical elements, the reflected light would not be normally received by the light receiving units 12a and 12b. Even if the light is directed to the light receiving units 12a and 12b by using mirrors and prisms and properly adjusting their angles, as the case with the hologram or diffraction grating having no high polymer cholesteric liquid crystal layer, the left-handed circularly polarized component of the light reflected to the light receiving unit 12a is shut off so that the intensity A of the light received by the light receiving units 12a is only about one half the intensity B of the light received by the other light receiving unit 12b ($A/B = \frac{1}{2}$). ...As one can readily appreciate, this equally applies to other embodiments described below, and, therefore, any further discussion on any attempts to simulate the present invention with optical elements, instead of a hologram foil 1 affixed to the object X, is omitted.”

Thus, Hoshino specifically teaches away from a system wherein an object reflects a polarized light signal to a signal transceiver system without diffracting the polarized light signal. In this regard, as shown in Figs. 1, 3, 7, 8, 11, 13, 20, and 22, Hoshino teaches that hologram foil 1 diffracts light. In particular, referring to Fig. 1, the light emitted by light source 11 is received and diffracted by hologram foil 1 towards light receiving units 12a and 12b. Based on the teachings and figures of Hoshino, hologram foil 1 does not reflect a light signal towards light receiving units 12a and 12b without first diffracting the light signal received from light source 11. Moreover, given the positioning of the light receiving units 12a and 12b relative to light source 11 and hologram foil 1, and as supported by the portions of Hoshino recited above, a system as taught by Hoshino wherein hologram foil 1 reflects light from light source 11 without diffracting the light would be ineffective because the diffractive properties of hologram foil 1 allow for the diffraction of light towards either light receiving unit 12a or light receiving unit 12b, thereby allowing for the identification of the object X.

Additionally, the system taught by Stevens relate to polarized filtering, and do not teach a system for identifying at least one object “wherein the at least one object reflects the polarized light signal without diffracting the polarized light signal” as recited by claims 1, 11, and 17.

Advantageously, as described in paragraph [0026] on pages 6-7 on the Specification, the present application provides that the object may be able to reflect a polarized light signal

using any of a number of materials, including, for example, prisms, mirrors or reflective metals. In addition, any configuration may be used that enables the polarized light signal to be reflected back towards the signal transceiver system. The use of optical elements such as prisms, mirrors, and/or reflective metals allow the system of the present invention to provide a cost-effective yet convenient solution for detecting the presence and characteristics of objects.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 11, and 17. Since claims 2-10 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 12-16 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 11, and claims 18-22 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 17, they are distinguishable over Hoshino and Stevens and are patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 11 and 17.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Marc S. Kaufman

Registration No. 35,212

Date: May 16, 2005

NIXON PEABODY LLP

c/o Gunnar G. Leinberg, Registration No. 35,584

Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051

Rochester, New York 14603-1051

Telephone: (585) 263-1014

Facsimile: (585) 263-1600